



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,669	08/07/2003	Lewis K. Cirne	P1954C-944	8894
21839 7590 08/12/2009 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404				
EXAMINER				
LIN, WEN TAI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2454				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/12/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/635,669

Applicant(s)

CIRNE ET AL.

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2454

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-38, 40-41, 43, 45-48, 50-53, 55-56, 58 and 60-65 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-38, 40-41, 43, 45-48, 50-53, 55-56, 58 and 60-65 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-11,13-23,25-27,29-31,33-38,40,41,43,45-48,50-53,55,56,58 and 60-65.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11, 13-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-38, 40-41, 43, 45-48, 50-53, 55-56, 58 and 60-65 are presented for examination.
2. This Office Action is made non-final because Applicant correctly pointed out that JavaScript's SWITCH-CASE statement was made available after the priority date of this application.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-11, 13-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-38, 40-41, 43, 45-48, 50-53, 55-56, 58 and 60-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moncur ["SAMS Teach Yourself JavaScript", Oct. 2000] in view of Carney et al. (hereafter "Carney")[U.S. Pat. No. 5774729].
5. Carney was cited in the previous office action. It is further noted that although Moncur's book was published in October, 2000, the cited JavaScript language was made available in 1995 (version 1.0). It is noted that most of the cited JavaScript functions in this instant office action

were originated in JavaScript1.0 except for the SWITCH-CASE statements, which was made available in JavaScript 1.2 (released in June 1997). However, as listed on page 1 of Moncur's event handling examples (see listings 7-3 and 7-4), all the SWITCH-CASE statements can be replaced by IF statements. This is to clarify in advance that (1) event handling expressed in terms of multiple conditions is well known in the art; and (2) it is a design choice to select a programming language (such as C, C++, Java, or JavaScript) to dispatch an event to a respective handling routine. As such, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have implemented the multiple conditions in Moncur's event handling examples with IF statements (i.e., based on JavaScript1.0) because the SWITCH-CASE and IF statements existed in many different programming languages such as C, C++ and Java well before JavaScript was made available.

6. As to claim 1, Moncur teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a method for routing an event to a human interface object in a computer system [e.g., page 18], wherein in example of "displaying data from a form" an "onClick" event associated with a "button" type of input is routed to a script function called "display()". Although in the example the event handler "display()" only deals with the "onClick" event associated with the "button", Moncur teaches that a dynamic event handler can be customized written to handle various type of events [pages 5-7]. With the capability of using "IF" or similar statements, different events can be routed to their respective applications [see the examples listed on pages 1-3].

Additionally, Carney teaches dispatching different event routing types from a same event handling unit, followed by sending the events to their respective event handlers (or applications)

[e.g., Carney: Abstract; Figs. 1-3].

Thus, based on the teachings of Moncur and Carney, it is obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art (at the time the invention was made) to combine the handling of various event types [e.g., `onClick`, `onMouseOver`, `onLoad`, `onError`, `onFocus`, `onBlur`, etc.] into one event handling unit by passing an assigned identifier [e.g., by associating each of the above event types with an identifier] and use the aforementioned IF statements in the event handler function [e.g., `dispatchcer(1)`, wherein the identifier “1” is assigned as a “routing type” of the “onClick” event] because it is within the knowledge of a programmer who knows how to write JavaScript to implement Carney’s handling unit (see Carney: Fig.1) with IF statements.

That is, an ordinary skilled programmer, based on the teachings of Moncur and Carney, would be able to write a program to perform following steps:

- assigning a routing type to an event;
- receiving an event specifying an assigned routing type;
- determining a routing mechanism for the received event based on the specified routing type;
- and
- routing the event to a human interface object based on the determined routing mechanism for the received event.

7. As to claim 2, Moncur further teaches that said routing type is a member of a set including a first routing type that is routed based on geometric coordinates of an event [Moncur: pages 14- 16: e.g., a mouse click event] and a second routing type that is routed based on an input focus [Moncur: pages 12 – 14: e.g., a keyboard related event such as entering/changing a text field].

8. As to claim 3, Moncur and Carney teach that the set further includes a third routing type that is broadcast to a plurality of interface objects [e.g., because of its commonality, an onError or onLoad event may be propagated to all the event handlers. For example, an IF statement may dispatch the event to all the relevant event handlers].

9. As to claims 4-5, the JavaScript allows a programmer to extend the plurality of routing types, wherein routing types can be added to said plurality [e.g., more IF statements can be added to or deleted from the existing IF statement block.

10. As to claims 6-7, Carney further teaches that one or more clients can register or unregister interest in an event such that when the event is received, the event is sent to each client which registered interest [e.g., col.1 lines 38-54; col. 10, lines 1-4; col.4, lines 1-19; i.e., when a routine is removed from its PPA it is unregistered from its associated event].

Further, it is noted that the JavaScript allows a programmer to add or remove any applications that are interested in receiving any respective event [i.e., one or more clients can “register” interest in an event such that when the event is received, the event is sent to each client which registered interest].

11. As to claim 8, Carney further teaches that an indication as to interest is maintained for each event and is updated when a client registers and unregisters interest in the event [col.4, lines 1-19; col.4, lines 41-60; col.6, lines 1-20; i.e., each member is assigned a member number or code as an indication of interest in the event and such membership is inherently updated through PPA after compilation]

12. As to claims 9-11, Carney does not specifically teach that the indication is a count which is incremented when a client registers interest in the event and is decremented when a client un-registers interest in the event, wherein said indication as to interest is maintained by adding an event to a handler table, and wherein when the indication no longer indicates interest in an event, the event is removed from said handler table.

However, since Carney's system maintains a list of members associated with each event, it would be obvious to add a parameter to count the number of members as an indication of interest in the respective event because it saves additional effort from counting the members in each list [e.g., col.6, lines 1-41; Table 1].

13. As to claim 60, Moncur further teaches that wherein said human interface object comprises an element of a graphical user interface that is displayed on a display device [e.g., see examples on pages 3-4 and 18].

14. As to claim 61, Moncur further teaches that said human interface object comprises one of a window, panel, editable text, push button, list box and radio button [e.g., see pages 8-9].

15. As to claims 13-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-38, 40-41, 43, 45-48, 50-53, 55-56, 58 and 62-65, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-11 and 60-61, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-11 and 60-61 above.

Conclusion

Examiner note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the contest of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday(8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(571) 273-8300 for official communications; and

(571) 273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

August 9, 2009

/Wen-Tai Lin/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454